DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 263 105 SP 026 844

AUTHOR Galvez-Hjornevik, Cleta

TITLE Teacher Mentors: A Review of the Literature.

INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 48p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Helping Relationship; *Master Teachers; *Mentors; *Professional Development; Role Models; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Orientation
IDENTIFIERS *Beginning Teacher Induction

ABSTRACT

Many local education agencies as well as school districts are currently designing induction programs for beginning teachers. One feature of these programs is the appointment of a mentor or sponsor teacher. This review is designed to summarize existing literature from the teaching profession on the mentoring relationship in order to assist educators in enhancing induction programs. This paper focuses on two major areas: (1) the need for assistance for the beginning teacher, and (2) mentoring among elementary and secondary teachers (an examination of mentoring in schools and existing induction programs). The appendices contain: (1) capsule descriptions of eleven selected beginning teacher programs; (2) criteria for selection of mentors or master teachers; (3) role and functions of master/mentor or master teachers; (4) a profile of a mentor; and (5) control and governance in the implementation of induction programs. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Austin, Texas 78712

ED263105

TEACHER MENTORS: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Cleta Galvez-Hjornevik

SP 026844

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

April, 1985

Teacher Mentors: A Review of the Literature

The most critical year for classroom teachers is the first--the beginning year. For in this year beginning teachers with romantic attitudes and consequently unrealistic expectations engage in either a successful and rewarding experience or a painful, frustrating and terminal one (Compton, 1979, p. 23). Bush (1978, p. 3) defines the first year of teaching as the most critical period in a teacher's career:

> ...the conditions under which a person carries out the first years of teaching have a strong influence on the level of effectiveness which that teacher is able to achieve and sustain over the years; on the attitudes which govern teachers' behavior over even a forty year career; and, indeed, on the decision whether or not to continue in the teaching profession (Bush, 1978, p. 3).

Frederick J. McDonald states a similar view in a recent ETS study which claims "the development of a teacher is shaped or determined by what happens to the teacher during the transition period" (McDonald, 1980, p. 25).

Recognizing the beginning teacher is faced with sometimes insurmountable challenges, many local education agencies as well as school districts are currently designing induction programs. One feature of these programs is the appointment of a mentor or sponsor teacher. This review is designed to summarize existing literature from the teaching profession on the mentoring relationship in order to assist educators in enhancing induction programs. This paper focuses on two major areas: the need for assistance for the beginning teacher and mentoring among elementary and secondary teachers (an examination of mentoring in schools and existing induction programs). A focus for the mentoring literature and induction programs was on education research found in the ERIC and Psych data base.

The Need for Assistance for the Beginning Teacher

McDonald notes that "surviving is the paramount goal, and the beginning teacher is likely to adopt the practices that help him or her survive" (McDonald, 1980, p. 23). Lortie (1975) recognizes that teaching seems to be the only profession where "the beginner becomes fully responsible from the first working day and performs the same tasks as a 25-year veteran." Janet Newberry (1977), in an investigation of how 23 beginning teachers learn about their chosen profession, concludes their education was largely dependent on experienced teachers around them. Newberry provides major findings that justify the need for carefully planned induction programs.

The study notes beginning teachers relied on experienced teachers to define for them appropriate standards for student achievement (Newberry, 1977, p. 19). Generally, beginning teachers hesitated to seek help unless they felt safe that their competence would not be questioned. For example, new teachers did not seem to feel they should know what to expect from their students, and therefore, they felt free to consult with experienced teachers about defining normal student achievement. Through staff room discussions, beginning teachers educated themselves on standards they could expect in their respective classrooms. Frequent consultation with experienced teachers were on the following topics: (a) the level of achievement of the beginning teacher's students, (b) what skills ought to be mastered by certain times of the year, (c) whether certain standards of work fell within the normal range, and (d) what kind and level of difficulty of work would be required by teachers at the next grade level (Newberry, 1977, p. 4-5).

Prevalent among beginning teachers was the fear of being thought incompetent as they were constantly faced with the expectation of performing as experienced teachers. This expectation apparently caused beginning

teachers to feel that any requests for assistance would be interpreted as signs of incompetence. Therefore, beginning teachers asked for assistance on "safe," minor problems. Newberry describes such problem(s):

> They asked experienced teachers for suggestions for physical education or phonic games. They asked advice on textbooks; they asked how to organize field trips. They asked specific questions that could be answered easily and quickly. In other words, organizational arrangements and the beginning teachers' own attitudes combined to create the myth of the instantaneously competent teacher who needs minimal help in developing an effective teaching program. (Newberry, 1977, p. 11)

Experienced teachers, on the other hand, were hesitant to offer assistance to beginners for fear of appearing to interfere (Newberry, 1977, p. 19). Not only did many experienced teachers wish not to interfere, but some indicated they did not desire to be involved in the problems of beginning teachers (Newberry, 1977, p. 6). One beginning teacher stated that in her school "teaching methods were never discussed, that she did not know what the other teachers were doing, and that she was quite sure that they did not care what she was doing." Other beginning teachers reported that experienced teachers remained detached from them (Newberry, 1977, p. 6-7).

Like the Newberry study, Roger S. Compton's (1977) study reveals similar frustration experienced by beginning teachers. One teacher states:

> I needed help in disciplining students. A new teacher in the ____ school system is expected to rely totally on his own resources. It is strictly a 'sink or swim' situation. Life is tough in this school and that attitude is extended toward teaching. Everyone is 'too busy' to

give an encouraging word. As one administrator told me, "You asked for this job--we didn't ask you." (Compton, 1979, p. 24)

Without direct help from the experienced teachers, the novice learned by watching and listening, in and out of classrooms. New teachers did not know how their programs compared to those of other teachers, they never had opportunity to see experienced teachers in action once they left their preservice programs, and furthermore experienced teachers seldom described their activities in classrooms. Beginning teachers in Newberry's study, however, were acquiring information concerning practices and beliefs of experienced teachers. The acquisition of knowledge was informal as they watched and interacted with teachers outside actual classroom situations. Their methodology entailed (a) listening to comments in the staff room and looking at materials brought in by experienced teachers, (b) listening to comments and investigating materials at the duplicating machine, and (c) looking through open classroom doors or visiting other teachers' classrooms before or after school. The indirect manner of observing the experienced teacher informed the beginner about the kind of work the faculty was engaged in and the techniques they used (Newberry, 1977, p. 14).

Newberry observed that whenever close relationships did develop between beginning and experienced teachers, they were always between teachers of the same grade, whose classrooms were located across from or beside each other, and whose teaching ideologies were compatible. Despite the barriers that most beginning and experienced teachers experienced, there appeared to be certain circumstances under which very close professional relationships could be established. Consciously, the novice searched for an experienced resource teacher who taught the same grade and in a manner similar to their own. If a person was identified who was consistent with the stated

criteria, the beginning teacher had identified a possible source of professional support and guidance for the year. If, however, these two criteria could not be filled by the same person, the beginning teacher abandoned hope of finding a source of extended assistance from the faculty (Newberry, 1977, p. 5). Newberry's study emphasized the difficulties some first year teachers experience.

The Derivation of the Mentor Concept

In many current programs, experienced teachers are being utilized to aid beginning teachers and have been identified as "mentor teachers." The arbitrary specification of some support teachers as "mentor teachers" is unsubstantiated in light of the historical significance of the term. "Mentor" was derived from Homer's Odyssey, wherein Athene took the image of Mentor, Ulysses' loyal friend, and was given responsibility for nurturing Telemachus (Ulysses's son) when his father ventured off to fight the Trojan War. Therefore, the term "mentor" historically denotes a trusted guide and counselor, and the mentor-protege relationship, a deep and meaningful association. In his book, James G. Clawson admonishes, however, that the relationship between Mentor and Telemachus was not an easy one. He states "...it was Mentor's difficult task to help Telemachus see the error in his judgment in a way that would allow the young protege to grow in wisdom and not in rebellion" (1980, pp. 145-146). In light of its historical connotation, the unbound use of the term "mentor" for teachers in induction programs is incorrect, or at least not totally accurate. Edgar Schein (1978, p. 178) has resolved that the term, mentor, today has been used loosely to mean teacher, coach, trainer, positive role model, developer of talent, opener of doors, protector, sponsor, and successful leader.

Mentoring Among Elementary and Secondary Teachers

Studies of Mentoring in Schools

Though research in education settings is quite limited, a few studies have been published which focus on teacher-teacher relationships and the phenomenon of mentoring in elementary and secondary schools. These studies were conducted by Natalie Gehrke and Richard S. Kay (1984) and Michael Fagan and Glen Walters (1982). Michael Fagan conducted a survey which asked 107 public school teachers and a comparison group of 70 police officers and 87 nurses to evaluate and report their experiences as mentors and proteges in informal relationships. Employing a liberal definition of mentor as "an experienced adult who befriends and guides a less experienced adult...one who can offer support, advice, and opportunity to a young adult," the researchers designed their study to assess the frequency and nature of mentoring in teaching and to examine relationships among job satisfaction, job burnout, and an assortment of poorly defined personal characteristics and skills such as "tactfulness" and "learning how to work with people." The design of the Fagan/Walters study is questionable because the authors failed to demonstrate a convincing rationale for comparing experiences of police officers, nurses, and teachers. These authors leave their reader with one vague notion, that mentoring, based on their own boundless definition, was prevalent among public high school teachers. The authors did, however, offer what appear to be useful recommendations to school administrators who want to increase mentoring among faculty:

1. Teach novice and veteran teachers the importance of mentoring.
2. Reinforce veteran teachers who show a sincere interest in helping beginners. Praise, extra training, time off, and pay raises might be effective reinforcers.

3. Arrange the working environment so it is conducive to senior and junior teachers becoming friends. Allow time for social exchange within the work day and promote off-work social activities (e.g., bowling team, bridge club, etc.) so that young teachers will become friends with more experienced teachers.

(Fagan & Walters, 1982, p. 117)

The authors, reluctant to assert that specific mentoring relationships can actually be arranged successfully due to "the chemistry factor," suggest nevertheless, that formal programs may be "worth trying". For a formal program they advise:

> For example, administrators could ask second and third year teachers to indicate who helped them most in learning the job. Those mentioned as most helpful could be asked to volunteer to be a sponsor or a coach for recently hired teachers. Beginners could be assigned to a coach for their first year. Hopefully, the novice would relate well to the coach and learn from him or her. (Fagan & Walters, 1982, p. 117)

Natalie J. Gehrke and Richard S. Kay (1984) investigated the presence of mentoring among teachers and the nature of the mentored relationships. A sample of 300 teachers from 12 schools (three high schools, three middle schools, and six elementary schools) was drawn from a large western suburban school district and teachers were asked to complete a short questionnaire concerning their careers in teaching. These authors cautiously used the term mentor to denote relationships which were "positive" and healthy, and distinguished the more neutral term, sponsor, for those whose relationships were less "benign." The authors state:

> One part of the questionnaire asked if at any stage in their career or career preparation there had been anyone outside the family who had

taken a personal interest in their careers and had helped, guided or sponsored them. One hundred eighty-eight teachers responded to the questionnaire and 111 indicated having known such a person. (p. 22)

Forty-one teachers of the 111 who claimed a mentor were interviewed and said their mentors were college professors/supervisors, school principals, former teachers, or co-workers. Only three teachers named a fellow teacher or co-worker as a mentor and no teacher named a co-operating teacher. The most frequently filled roles (as identified by Schein, 1978) included confident, role model, developer of talents, and sponsor. "Door opener" was described by four teachers, "protector" by two, and "successful leader" by no one (Gehrke & Kay, 1984, p. 22).

Gehrke and Kay also focused on the question of how mentor-protege relationships develop in the school setting:

> ...teachers said the relationship began when they came into contact with the potential mentor in an educational setting such as a class or their first teaching assignment. Reports of the teachers suggest that the relationships began with signals from the potential mentor that they were "taking an interest" in the teacher. Such behavior as frequent and apparently friendly visits to the classroom, joking, informal conversation, and encouraging remarks were seen as this special attention labelled "taking an interest".
>
> (Gehrke & Kay, 1984, p. 22)

Findings indicate the mentor and protege came together for a specific purpose (e.g., teacher training), and when that purpose was accomplished, the relationship disbanded--"there was not structure for continued personal contact" (Gehrke & Kay, 1984, p. 22). The authors imply the relationships underwent change as they matured:

> ...as the relationship continued to develop it became more professional and more personal--in other words, it did grow to be more comprehensive. The relationship was more informal and caring as between two friends, and yet it was more likely to address professional growth questions in instructional, curricular, and classroom management issues.
>
> (Gehrke & Kay, 1984, p. 23)

Not neglected in the survey was an analysis of the potential benefits of mentoring relationship: one-fourth of the teachers claimed they would not have made the same career decisions had it not been for their mentors; the majority of the teachers said they believed that finding a mentor was important to a teaching career; and, all but one indicated a desire to be a mentor. The authors conclude "...there may be a kind of legacy of mentors or sponsors--an increased willingness to assume the helper's roles when one has been so helped." Despite the declarations of the surveyed teachers to become mentors, Gehrke and Kay disclose that few teachers become mentors for other teachers at any point in the preparation and induction period. The authors ask: "Does this mean that the impediments--spatial, temporal, psychosocial, organizational, or whatever--are too difficult to overcome?" (Gehrke & Kay, 1984, p. 23-24).

The literature presented here is significant if only to make educators aware that mentoring among teachers does exist to a limited extent. The next sector of the literature review will examine techniques for devising a mentoring program and will examine some existing induction programs which encourage a mentor-protege type relationship.

Induction Programs That Incorporate the Mentoring Relationship

Limited literature exists in the Psych or ERIC data base which advises individuals on establishing a mentoring program in their organization or describing current programs in schools. However, educators seeking to establish a mentoring program in their school district will benefit from noting the nature of existing programs and recommendatory articles written by others. Australian, Richard P. Tisher states: " The nature of the educational setting, contacts with peers and types of induction experiences" are among influential features in enhancing professional development (Tisher, 1979, p.3). Tisher along with other educators, school districts and state departments of education have recognized the need for effective induction programs (N.B. Zeichner's "Capsule Description of Eleven Selected Beginning Teacher Programs" in Appendix A).

Phillip C. Schlechty (1984) claims the purpose of induction is "to develop in new members of an occupation those skills, forms of knowledge, attitudes, and values that are necessary to effectively carry out their occupational role." He verifies the primary aim of induction is "to create conditions that cause new members to internalize the norms of the occupation to the point that the primary means of social control (i.e., control over performance) is self-control" (Schlechty, 1984, p. 1). Schlechty implies mentor relationships in his description of effective systems:

1. Effective induction systems are based on and oriented toward clearly stated, well articulated, and generally understood expectations and norms. Without well-articulated and codified norms, the development of a systematic induction process is nearly impossible.

2. Effective induction systems explicitly and implicitly use the process of recruitment and selection as an integral part of the induction process.

3. In an effective induction system, entry into the occupation is marked by distinct stages and statuses (...time, grade, and performance are related to status in fully developed occupations).

4. Effective induction systems have mechanisms that encourage mutual support among status equals.

5. Effective induction systems usually call upon neophytes to undergo elaborate vocabulary-building activities, frequently presented as courses about particular subjects.

6. Effective induction systems usually assume that those who are admitted to training are likely to become full-fledged members of the occupation.

7. Occupations with the most effective induction systems rely greatly on intensive clinical supervision, demonstration, coaching, and constant corrective feedback by real practitioners in real situations.

8. In occupations with the most effective induction systems, responsibility for evaluating new members and providing corrective feedback, training, and support is diffused throughout the group.

(Schlechty, 1984, p. 5-9)

The mentoring relationship comes under the umbrella of Schlechty's definition of effective induction systems which he illustrates by utilizing the Career Development Program (CDP) of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. The purpose of the CDP plan at Charlotte-Mecklenburg is to develop the capacity of new teachers to comply with the system's performance expectations. Beginning teachers, through mandatory participation in

sequential training activities, were made aware of the literature on effective teaching and were given opportunity for practice and demonstration of effective teaching skills with peers, experienced teachers, and administrators. They were assigned to advisory/assessment (A/A) teams comprised of the principal, the assistant principal of instruction (API), and a senior teacher mentor. Members of the A/A teams were expected to observe and confer regularly with new teachers, provide new teachers with necessary coaching and support and assist beginning teachers in locating other needed sources of training and support. The principal was expected to spend a half day per semester and the API and the mentor, spend half a day per month, observing and providing feedback to the beginning teacher. The trained observer and evaluators were to observe beginning teachers three times during the first year (Schlechty, 1984, p.10). Schlechty acknowledged, however, that the greatest short-term weakness of the program was the lack of systematic training and support for mentors, A/A teams, principals, and assistant principals.

Similarly, in Toledo, Ohio Cheryl M. Waters and Terry L. Wyatt report that in 1985 an intern-intervention program was launched which used experienced teachers to train and evaluate beginning teachers. Uniformity and due process were clearly monitored as seven "consulting teachers" supervised nearly seventy beginning teachers. The benefits for the consulting teachers were twofold: 1) a close match between the teaching field of an intern and that of a consultant was possible and 2) freedom was given these teachers to channel all their energies into training beginning teachers. Consulting experienced teachers possessed: (1) Five years of outstanding teaching service, (2) Confidential references confirming outstanding experiences from principals, TFT representatives, and three peer

teachers, and (3) Demonstrated ability in written and oral expression. Consultants, chosen by subject specialization, were to serve for three years after which time they returned to their classroom assignments. The skills that were focused on for development of the new teacher in the program included: (1) teaching techniques, (2) classroom management skills, and (3) content knowledge. Particular targeted abilities included:

> The beginner's ability to ask meaningful questions that lead learners through a lesson, the beginner's ability to interact appropriately and impartially with students, and the beginner's ability to measure student progress. (Waters & Wyatt, 1985, p. 365)

Continuous goal setting through conferences, based on detailed observations, characterized the evaluation process of the beginning teachers. The responsibility of the consultant to the intern was threefold: (1) to point out a deficiency, (2) suggest a new teaching method, or (3) demonstrate a sample lesson. Although the consulting teacher in the Toledo program were not mentors (in the literal sense of the word), they were expected to fulfill mentor-like roles.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg and Toledo are not the only school systems reported to have engaged in a mentor teacher-like program. Judy Ann Krupp (1984) reports that in two elementary schools in Connecticut, a series of eight workshops designed to foster mentoring relationships in order to ensure staff growth and development, had positive results. The program topics centered on an introductory session for the entire staff, workshops on adult developmental changes, stress and coping mechanisms, and active listening skills which were consistently related to the life of the participant and to mentoring. Krupp confirms that although mentoring was occurring in the schools before the project started, the workshops caused

older teachers to acknowledge their own sense of self worth, form new friendships, and provide assistance--professional and personal--for young teachers.

Most recently (April, 1985), Susan Riemer Sacks and Patricia Brady described a Mentor Teacher Pilot Project developed through the collaborative effort of the Bureau of Staff Development in New York City and the Barnard College of Education faculty. In this program retired teachers assumed the "mentor role" with beginning teachers. The mentor teacher slogan, "to motivate, not dominate" reflects their basic strategies for supporting inductees. Their objectives for inductees were (1) to develop their own teaching styles and confidence, (2) to become decision makers in their classrooms, (3) to understand children's cognitive and affective needs, (4) to become sensitive to different learning styles, and (5) to broaden and deepen their repertoire of learning activities and effective ways of teaching and coping with the first year (Sacks & Brady, 1985, p. 17). The authors describe the current status of the project:

> The project is presently in action following a schedule of intensive 12 hours of mentoring in September, February, and March and six hours during the other months of the school year. So far, all mentors who began in September are still involved. All principals are enthusiastic. All new teachers are still teaching in the assigned schools and seem to have accepted the mentors' participation. The project is being evaluated by site visits, observations, logs, questionnaires, and interviews with both mentors and new teachers. (Sacks & Brady, 1985, p. 18)

Matt Benningfield et. al. uniquely offer a proposal to establish demonstration schools for the Jefferson County Public Schools soliciting the

assistance of Louisville University, in Louisville, Kentucky. The proposed demonstration school incorporates the use of "master/mentor teachers" ("m/m teachers") for faculty development and inservice. The select faculty, composed of outstanding teachers (master/mentor teachers), must possess the following characteristics:

> ...each has demonstrated his or her expertise as an effective teacher in the classroom. Such a teacher should also be competent in demonstrating his or her expertise to other teachers. These teachers should also demonstrate leadership ability, the ability to work with other teachers, and be committed to and show potential for engaging in educational research.
>
> (Benningfield et. al., 1984, p. 5)

The criteria for selecting master teacher candidates, master/mentor teachers and master teachers in Benningfield's proposed program is provided in Appendix B. The faculty would engage in regular classroom assignments and would serve as mentors to visiting teachers. Visiting teachers, assigned a mentor, would study new teaching techniques and curricular approaches from the mentor for at least sixteen weeks. Once awarded master teacher status, they would return to their original school in order to modify teachings (Benningfield et. al., 1984, p. 5). The roles and functions of the master/mentor teachers are provided in Table 2 (Appendix C). Benningfield and associates emphasize the surmountable demands of the master/mentor teacher and, therefore, propose a competitive salary commensurate with engineers in American society (Benningfield et. al, 1984, p. 6-7).

A formal, well funded, Mentor Teacher program was established by the California Department of State Education. The purpose of the California

Mentor Teacher Program was to encourage retention of exemplary teachers and to upgrade the skills of new and experienced teachers. Mentor teachers were therefore selected and their time was allocated to staff development with teacher trainees, new and experienced teachers, and to curriculum development. Teachers in turn received a $4,000 annual stipend (California State Department of Education, 1983, p.3-4).

Mentor teachers in California are selected solely on the basis of exemplary teaching and therefore are not required to hold administrative or other special credentials (such as competencies in evaluation techniques). Five percent of the teachers are designated mentor-teachers by the State Department of Education in current funding levels. Nomination of mentor teachers starts with a carefully comprised "selection committee" composed of certified classroom teachers and school administrators both of whom are chosen to serve by their peers. Candidates are chosen by a majority vote after classroom observations are conducted by elected administrators and teachers. Finally, the governing board of the school district permits acceptance or rejection of the nominations (California State Department of Education, 1983, p. 4-6).

Mentor-teacher nomination and assessment is subjected to defined criteria by the legislature and the school districts. The legislature demands the credentialed classroom teacher maintain permanent status, substantial recent experience in classroom instruction, and demonstrate exceptional teaching ability (effective communication skills, subject matter knowledge, and mastery of teaching strategies) (California State Department of Education, 1983, p. 7). Districts are given detailed lists of criteria to use in selecting mentors:

- Demonstrates knowledge and commitment to subject matter

- Subject matter expertise
- Ability to convey enthusiasm for the subject to students
- Demonstrates belief in student ability to succeed
- Commitment to setting high expectations for students
- Competence to teach at various student ability levels
- Use of appropriate grading standards, including resistance to the practice of giving inflated grades
- Willingness to give special attention to students requiring help
- Success in fostering excellent student performance
- Gives evidence of professional stature
- Leadership, e.g. in organizing projects on his or her own initiative
- Recognition by those in the same profession
- Respect of his or her colleagues.

(California Department of Education, 1983, p. 7)

The department has carefully defined the process for assessing mentor candidate qualifications, as has Linda Lambert (1985), whose current work provides a comprehensive list of skills for mentoring and also a pertinent list of essential elements of adult learning (see Appendix D).

The California department allows for variation in roles for mentor teachers such as providing staff development for faculty, acting as lead instructor in retaining experienced teachers, professional trainer of teacher trainees, guides for new teachers, "fellows" in teacher training academics, and finally acting as "curriculum developer" (California State Department of Education, 1983, p. 9). New mentor teachers are supported in their new role by the State Department's commitment to:

1. Provide training for mentors.
2. Secure commitment from site administrators and teachers for work

with the mentor.

3. Set reasonable expectations about what mentors can accomplish.
4. Provide a forum for mentor teachers to assist one another.

(California State Department of Education, 1983, p. 11)

The report of the state education department recommends funding for the mentor-teacher program through stipends for the participants, funding through the legislature, and apportionment of monies to participating districts (California State Department of Education, 1983, p. 11-12). The McDonald study, as well, offers guidelines which might be helpful in understanding funding sources (see Appendix E).

The data presented in this section suggest the nature of novice teacher programs is school district specific, and that many programs are beginning to adapt the mentor teacher relationship or at least components of this relationship. Projects currently in existence (Charlotte-Mecklenburg, Toledo, Connecticut, New York City, and California) and the proposed program for Jefferson County (Kentucky) Schools provide substantive guidelines for administrators/teachers attempting to ease the stresses experienced by the beginning teacher. The California system, in particular, has forged the way for the mentor teacher concept, by instituting an extensive and well-funded program which has incorporated the career ladder concept. Significant is that all induction programs discussed recognize the need for some type of mentor or sponsor teacher. A careful selection of teachers to serve in the mentor status would set the pace for the future of induction programs. Their influence on the impressionistic beginning teacher would be crucial.

Conclusions

The purpose of this literature review was to investigate the pertinent literature on mentoring among teachers. Much of the research presented has useful implications for planning formal or informal mentoring programs or induction programs in schools. The predominant mode of induction in schools in the United States and elsewhere has been the "sink or swim" method. Newberry's research, in particular, emphasizes the need for an induction program that utilizes support teachers during the first year or at least the first six months of teaching school, for it is during this initial introduction into the profession that many young persons are likely to need collegial assistance. Potentially, the beginning teacher would seek a guide or transitional figure to introduce them into their adult world of work. An exemplar teacher, carefully selected, could initially (first semester or year) provide the beginning teacher with the knowledge of the school and the curriculum to which they have become party. This support teacher with mentor-like qualities might eliminate some stresses of the first year teacher. Furthermore, Gehrke and Kay state that with time teachers in mentor relationships develop a more comprehensive relationship in a professional and personal manner.

In the Homeric sense of the word, a mentor cannot be assigned to a novice because a mentor-protege pair connotes a voluntary and deep relationship, not limited to basic direction and encouragement (which more characterizes the responsibilities of a coach). Research indicates, however, that teachers benefit from mentor-like relationships although they are not necessarily mentored by fellow teachers. Also, it appears that while many teachers are desirous of the position of mentor, relatively few have assumed the role.

There are significant benefits for the beginning and experienced (often older) teacher from engaging in a mentor-protege relationship. The beginning teacher's advantages are numerous, including: guidance in classroom techniques and management, help with subject matter content, and reduction of stress (often incurred in large doses during the first year). Older teachers, as Krupp's research suggests, can potentially improve their sense of self worth and form new friendships as a result of engaging in a helping relationship with the novice.

Certainly, it would be to the educator's advantage to continue researching the mentor-protege phenomena among teachers. The vital role allocated the "mentor teacher" in the induction process necessitates a greater understanding of the potential for this association and its subsequent impact on the induction of teachers in our elementary and secondary schools.

References

Benningfield, M., & Others. (1984, February). A proposal to establish demonstration schools and the identification, training and utilization of master/mentor and master teacher: A joint school district and University of Louisville project. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, San Antonio, TX.

Bush, R. (1966). The formative years. In The real world of the beginning teacher. Washington, DC: National Education Agency.

California mentor teacher program, program advisory. (1983, November). Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

Clawson, J. G. (1980). Mentoring in managerial careers. In C. B. Derr (Ed.), Work, family and the career (pp. 144--165). New York: Praeger.

Compton, R. S. (1979). The beginning high school teachers...apprentice or professional? American Secondary Education, 9, 23-29.

Fagan, M., & Walters, G. (1982). Mentoring among teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 76(2), 113-117.

Gehrke, N. J., & Kay, R. S. (1984). The socialization of beginning teachers through mentor-protege relationships. Journal of Teacher Education, XXXV(3), 21-24.

Homer. (1911). Homer's odyssey (H. B. Cotterill, M. A. Trans.). London: George G. Harrap and Company.

Krupp, J. A. (1984, April). Mentor and protege perceptions of mentoring relationships in an elementary and secondary school in Connecticut. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Lambert, L. (1985, April). Adult learning, teacher preparation and inservice: An urgent agenda. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McDonald, F. (1980). The problems of beginning teachers: A crisis in training. (Contract No. 400-78-0069.) Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Newberry, J. M. (1977, April). The first year of experience: Influences on beginning teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Sacks, S., & Brady, P. (1985, April). Who teaches the city's children? A study of New York City first year teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Schein, E. (1978). Career dynamics: Matching individual and organizational needs. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Schlechty, P. C. (1984, October). A framework for evaluating induction into teaching. Paper presented at "Policy, Practices, and Research in Teacher Education: Beyond the Looking Glass," a national conference hosted by the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

Tisher, R. P. (1979, January). Teacher induction: An aspect of the education and professional development of teachers. Paper presented at "Exploring Issues in Teacher Education: Questions for Future Research," a national invitational conference hosted by the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.

Waters, C. L., & Wyatt, T. L. (1985). Toledo's internship: The teachers' role in excellence. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 365-367.

Zeichner, K. M. (1979, April). Teacher induction practices in the United States and Great Britain. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Appendix A

Capsule Description of Eleven Selected Beginning Teacher Programs

(Zeichner, 1979)

Capsule Description of Eleven Selected Beginning Teacher Programs

1. The N.A.S.S.P. Project on the Induction of Beginning Teachers (Hunt, 1968; Swanson, 1968)

This project was a three-year experimental effort (1965-1968) funded by the Carnegie Corporation and designed specifically to test the validity of Conant's recommendations concerning teacher induction. The final year of the project involved 188 beginning high school teachers in 33 schools in five states. There were two major purposes to the project: (1) to give beginning teachers extra time and help so that they might better develop professionally; (2) to discover through experimentation means by which the first years of teaching might be improved. Despite a great deal of variation among local projects, there were four elements that all sites held in common: (1) the teaching loads of beginning teachers were reduced by one class period; (2) experienced teachers were appointed to work with 3-8 beginning teachers and were given a reduced workload of one period; (3) assistance was given to beginning teachers in finding and using good instructional materials; (4) beginning teachers were provided with special information on the characteristics of the community, student body and school policies.

Individual and group assistance was provided to beginning teachers on as as needed basis within a four-phase framework: Phase I--a preservice orientation; Phase II--a beginning of school orientation supplemental to or in place of the regular school orientation program; Phase III-a first semester program focusing on the "practical;" Phase IV--a second semester program involving a gradual shift from practical concerns to more long range and theoretical concerns. Program activities included group seminars, observations of experienced teachers, analyses of videotaped lessons and

team teaching. A formal and independent evaluation of the project was undertaken by the R&D department of the Detroit Public Schools in 1967. This evaluation consisted of a series of questionnaires given to beginning and cooperating teachers and analyses of logs kept by the beginning teachers. The focus of the evaluation was on the kinds of help most valued by the beginning teachers and on the nature of program impact.

2. The Washington State Modified Internship for Beginning Teachers (Hite et al., 1966; Hite, 1968)

Following a request from the Washington S.E.A. for experimental efforts to improve conditions for first year teachers, Hite et al. (1966) designed an experiment to test the effects of reduced work loads and intensive inservice training on the attitudes and behaviors of beginning teachers. The project, which ran during the 1965-66 school year, involved 120 beginning elementary teachers from five school districts. There were three different experimental treatments and one control group (30 teachers per group). Two of the experimental groups were given a 25% reduced teaching load (¼ daily released time) and either were observed by and conferenced with a district supervisor twice a week or visited classrooms of experienced teachers twice a week. The third experimental group was given only a 25% reduced teaching load (25% fewer pupils). The control group received no special treatment other than the regular school district orientation procedures. The four groups were matched on the basis of their grade level assignment and grade in student teaching. Each beginning teacher (experimental and control) was observed four times with a classroom observation system and completed an attitude scale prior to each visit. A follow-up study was conducted during 1966-67 with 10 randomly selected

teachers from each group to determine whether the effects of reduced loads and support persisted.

3. The Oswego N.Y. Plan for Team Supervision of Beginning Teachers (Reading et al., 1967; McGinnis, 1968)

Funded by the New York S.E.A., this experimental effort was designed to help first year teachers to improve their classroom performance and to reduce the beginning teacher dropout rate. The program consisted of an experienced teacher (team leader) trained in a specific model of supervision working with a team of four-five beginning teachers in the same building. The focus was on the team members providing mutual assistance through observations and analyses of each member's teaching. The goal was to have beginning teachers eventually develop habits of self-analysis. A significant feature of this program was that the supervision provided was totally divorced from regular school district evaluation procedures. Nothing that took place in the team sessions was ever communicated to building administrators. In the first year of operation (1967-68) the program involved 127 beginning teachers in 20 schools with a team leader in each school. Money was given to each school district by the S.E.A. to provide released time for team members as the district saw fit. An evaluation conducted by the S.E.A. was still in progress at the time the program descriptions were written. Tentative results are reported.

4. The Beginning Teacher Development Program in Hawaii (Noda, 1968)

This pilot program which was a joint effort of the University of hawaii, the Hawaii S.E.A. and local L.E.A.'s was a statewide effort to provide added support to beginning teachers. During its first year of operation (1966-67), the program involved 500 beginning teachers in over 100 elementary and secondary schools throughout the state of Hawaii.

Forty-eight experienced teachers were appointed to provide supervision for beginning teachers at a ratio of about 1:10. Each supervisor worked in several schools and was given some released time for supervisory activities, but it is not clear from the report of the program how much released time was provided. The overall goal of the program was to develop "self-directing" beginning teachers. This program, unlike many others, did not separate the supervisory support from regular school district evaluation procedures. Each supervisor was required to submit an assessment of his or her beginning teachers to the building principals at the end of the year. Two University of Hawaii consultants provided supervision courses and individual consultations for the supervisors. An evaluation of the program was conducted, but it is not clear from the data presented what procedures were used.

5. The Wheeling, Ill., Teacher Inservice Training Program (Johnson, 1969)

This federally funded (Title 3) program which began in one high school with 22 beginning teachers in 1967-68 was later expanded to include additional schools and experienced teachers. The L.E.A. was totally responsible for planning, implementing, and evaluating the program. The focus of the program was on getting beginning teachers involved in assessing their own classroom behavior and in seeing their students as individuals. The content consisted of one full day per month released time for beginning teachers to attend seminars in groups of 8-10. The seminars were staffed by district personnel. Some additional but unspecified amount of released time was also provided for beginning teachers to observe in the classrooms of more experienced teachers. The content of the seminars varied according to the expressed needs and concerns of the beginning teachers. Additionally, many simulation exercises were utilized which focused on interpersonal and

group dynamics. Seminar sessions were videotaped to enable participants to become more aware of their own behavior. An evaluation conducted by the L.E.A. focused on user satisfaction and on changes in beginning teacher attitudes.

6. The Wilmette, Ill., Program for Beginning Teachers (Wilmette Public Schools, 1969)

This federally funded (Title 3) program for beginning teachers with 0-2 years experience was initiated in 1968-69. In its initial year the project serviced 80 beginning teachers in 9 public and private Wilmette, Illinois, elementary schools. The program consisted of a five-day summer orientation workshop and one-half day per month released time for beginning teachers to participate in workshops, demonstrations, and classroom observations and individual consultations. Additionally, eight Saturday workshops were held on issues related to curriculum, teaching methods and instructional materials. Experienced "helping teachers" were appointed to work with four to six beginning teachers in planning and self-evaluation and they observed neophytes' classes. These helping teachers were given some unspecified form of supervisory training and limited released time. Finally, university advisor-consultants were available on scheduled inservice days to provide additional assistance to beginning teachers.

All of the assistance given in this program was totally separate from the district's teacher evaluation procedures. Also, an attempt was made to provide an individualized program for each neophyte and to meet beginning teacher needs as they emerged. At the end of the first year of the program, plans were underway to form an Advisory Council of all representative interest groups. The Institute for Educational Development in Downers Grove, Illinois, served as a consultant to the L.E.A in conducting a program

evaluation which focused on the degree to which neophytes felt that their needs were being met and with the satisfaction with the program expressed by all role groups.

7. The New York City Supportive Training Program for Inexperienced and New Teachers (Honigman, 1970)

This pilot program funded by the New York Office of Urban Education was initiated in 1968-69 to provide supportive services for beginning teachers and to reduce teacher dropout rates in schools with a history of high teacher turnover. The program was concentrated primarily in low income areas of Manhattan, Brooklyn, and the Bronx. The content consisted of providing skilled and experienced "master teachers" to serve as consultant resources for beginning teachers. These master teachers assisted individual neophytes in many areas including curriculum implementation, establishing classroom routines and teaching methods. Some inservice workshops were also conducted for groups of beginning teachers. Each master teacher worked with approximately nine neophytes and was given 100% released time. Additionally, a wide variety of school district specialists were made available to the program as back-up resources. The N.Y.C. Office of Personnel provided some unspecified training and support for the 152 master teachers. A program evaluation was conducted by the Office of Urban Education in which STINT teachers were compared with a control group of beginning teachers in similar settings. This evaluation was concerned with the amount of staff turnover, observations of neophytes' classes, teacher and student attitudes and the extent to which the program was implemented.

8. The South Texas New Teacher Orientation Project (Dooley, 1970)

This project, which involved six L.E.A.'s, two I.H.E.'s and a regional educational service center, was initiated in 1968-69 with the involvement of

357 beginning teachers (either new to the profession or new to a school district). The program was designed to strengthen the teaching skills and professional commitment of new teachers to work with low income Mexican-American pupils in Rio Grande border schools. The first phase of the program involved giving beginning teachers released time to attend one-hour monthly small group discussion-training sessions led by university consultants and assisted by experienced teachers. These seminars were largely unstructured and focused on the concerns expressed by beginning teachers. There was also a limited but unspecified amount of released time provided for neophytes to observe experienced teachers. An evaluation conducted by the educational service center consisted of a questionnaire which was sent to all of the program participants at the end of the first year of operation. The focus of the questionnaire was on the extent to which program objectives were achieved, the job satisfaction of beginning teachers, projected teacher turnover, and detailed feedback about the value of the small group sessions. In the second year of operation a group of the original neophytes produced a teacher orientation booklet for use in Rio Grande schools.

9. The Washington, D.C., Program for the Recruitment of Beginning Teachers (Scates, 1970)

This federally funded (Title 5) project was designed to provide beginning teachers with support, training, and assistance to help them succeed in a large urban school district. Additionally, there was a particular focus on helping beginning teachers to use varied approaches in the teaching of reading and language arts and in developing skills in human relations. The program consisted of a two-week summer orientation workshop, 3 one-day released time workshops, and continuing individual support and

assistance throughout the year. it is unclear from the report of the program how and by whom this individual assistance was provided. The first year of the program involved 36 teachers who were either new to the profession or new to the D.C. school district. A program evaluation conducted by the district R&D department consisted of a series of questionnaires focusing on user satisfaction and on how well the program objectives were implemented.

10. The Salem, New Hampshire, Program for Helping the Beginning Teacher (Marashio, 1971)

This program was initiated to help beginning teachers in one Salem, New Hampshire, high school. The total program was carried out utilizing existing school staff and without any released time costs. There were four interrelated program components. First, each beginning teacher was paired with an experienced cooperating teacher. Each member of a dyad taught in the same subject area and had common free periods for conferencing. The cooperating teachers served as resources to the neophytes and had nothing to do with formal assessment procedures. Secondly, each beginning teacher was trained to interpret data gathered from the Flanders Interaction Analysis system. Two trained staff members observed each beginner with a Flanders and held an post-analysis session after each observation. Each beginner was observed twice in this way. Next, seminars were held every other week after school as a chance for the neophytes to exchanges problems and ideas. The beginning teachers suggested the topics and speakers for these sessions. Finally, beginning teachers were observed an unspecified number of times by the curriculum coordinator and department chair with a post-analysis occurring after each lesson. Beginners were also given some opportunity to observe experienced teachers and kept a journal throughout the year. There

is limited evaluation data reported on this program concerning the extent of user satisfaction.

11. The Alabama First Year Teacher Pilot Program (Alabama S.E.D., 1974; Blackburn et al., 1975)

This final and one of the most complex of the beginning teacher programs was initiated on a pilot basis in 1973-74 following a resolution by the Alabama S.E.A. stating that I.H.E.'s, L.E.A.'s and S.E.A. should jointly assume responsibility for the success of beginning teachers. The S.E.A. totally funded this project which involved 100 beginning elementary, secondary and special education teachers in 7 school districts during its first year of operation. A support team representing each of the three sponsoring groups provided individual support for each beginning teacher. First, there were 6 University of Alabama clinical professors, each of whom worked with 16-19 neophytes. The professors observed, demonstrated teaching techniques and helped each teacher conduct a self-assessment of their needs. Secondly, each beginning teacher was assigned to one of two S.E.A. consultants who visited with the neophytes in their classrooms and chaired support-team meetings. Finally, each L.E.A. had a program coordinator who helped beginning teachers become acquainted with the school and community and obtain instructional resources. Thus, each neophyte had a support team of three: one clinical professor, one L.E.A. coordinator, and one S.E.A. consultant. The overall goal of the program was to determine the most common and specific needs of the first year teachers and to help them assess their progress toward specified goals. An evaluation was conducted in which 100 teachers were compared with a control group on the basis of questionnaires and interviews. The evaluation was concerned with

documenting the kinds of support received by beginning teachers, teacher attitudes, student attitudes and student achievement.

Appendix B

MM [Master/Mentor], MTC [Master Teacher Candidate] and Master Teachers

Criteria for Selection

(Benningfield, M., & Others, 1984)

MM [Master/Mentor], MTC [Master Teacher Candidate] and Master Teachers

Criteria for Selection

1. Demonstrated skills in the classroom
2. Commitment to the classroom
3. Commitment to education
4. Commitment to children
5. Commitment to inservice education
6. Commitment to professional and personal growth
7. Demonstrated ability for instructional leadership (classroom)
8. Ability to communicate with peers (other classroom teachers)
9. Willingness (ability to be involved in inservice education under a variety of environments and conditions
10. Able to develop and utilize a variety of support systems
11. Flexible
12. High problem-solving ability
13. Be able to anticipate
14. High content knowledge
15. Be able to analyze
16. High verbal skills (articulate)
17. Able to handle complex situations
18. Able to develop sundry options and alternatives
19. Ability to make appropriate choices among a variety of alternative and options
20. Knowledgeable about changes in methodologies, knows how to use them appropriately (e.g., micro-computers, mastery teaching) in classroom
21. High knowledges of learning theories, Educational Psychology, and knows children
22. Willingness to be involved actively in applied and action research in the classroom and school
23. Willingness to travel (appropriate for M teachers)

24. Demonstrated willingness to expend effort and energy beyond the typical school day

25. Highly creative

26. Independent thinker

27. Process oriented

28. Knowledgeable about the _____ effecting education (classroom, non-classroom factors, e.g., political, social, economic, community issues, etc.)

29. Demonstrated use of a variety of teaching techniques in the classroom

30. Knows current literature in his/her field of interests (Elementary Ed., Math Ed., Social Studies Ed., etc.) as well as the broad areas (e.g., effective schools and effective teacher literature)

31. Can use individual and groups (small, large) teaching techniques in the classroom

32. Can be original

33. Is "bright"

34. Can support and reinforce others

35. Able to develop support systems for teachers

36. Brings out the best in others

37. Has high leadership ability, but can be a part of a group (highly skilled in group dynamics)

38. Is professionally, personally, and psychologically secure with themselves and their abilities

39. Can give objective criticism

40. Can take criticism

41. Willingness to change ideas, ideals, etc., when professionally appropriate

42. Must have a Master's Degree and CEU/PSD/Rank I Credits

43. Have a continuing education plan and has implemented part (or all)

44. Well read professionally and nonprofessionally

45. Has a history of high student achievement in classes taught

Appendix C

Role and Function of MM [Master/Mentor] and Master Teachers

(Benningfield, M., & Others, 1984)

ROLE AND FUNCTION OF MM AND MASTER TEACHERS

ROLES AND FUNCTIONS	TEACHER CATEGORY	
	MM*	MT
1. Demonstration of excellence in classroom teaching	District Wide	Local School
2. In-service instruction (individual, school district-wide)	District Wide	Local School
3. Curriculum development (school building level, district-wide)	District Wide	Local School
4. Development of new teaching techniques and methodologies	District Wide	Local School
5. Active disseminator of excellence in teaching	District Wide	Local School
6. Participate in applied and action research	District Wide	(not required)
7. Function as teacher role models for teachers	District Wide	Local School
8. Function as teacher role models for administrators	District Wide	Local School
9. Provide instructional leadership in assigned school(s)	District Wide	Local School
10. Provide feedback on effective (as well as ineffective) programs	District Wide	Local School
11. Participate in "think-tank" activities on a building level; systems level	District Wide	Local School
12. Function in a Master Teacher team to solve instructional problems in individual settings (e.g., classroom, school) - would work with regular teachers in a joint effort in problem solving	District Wide	Local School
13. Translate theory and research into practice (work closely with University)	District Wide	Local School
14. Work closely with school building principal(s)	District Wide	Local School

*MM teachers have district-wide and building level obligations

Appendix D

A Profile of A Mentor

(Lambert, 1985)

Appendix D

CHART II

Skills of Mentoring	Essential Elements of Adult Learning
orchestrate cognitive dissonnance and consonance through such approaches as questioning, feedback and coaching	cognitive dissonance/ consonance
provide solid experience as a context for examining ideas and actions	experience
demonstrate strong commitment to personal growth and development include continued learning, self-reflection, analysis and critique	purpose, self-analysis
foster self-direction in others by encouraging independence and self-analysis	self-direction, emacipation
understand the stages of a mentoring relationship, altering the interaction in response to growing autonomy	autonomy, adult development
demonstrate flexibility by knowing when to be a teacher, facilitator, listener, inquirer	cognitive dissonance/ consonance, support
demonstrate skills as an action researcher	inquiry, dissonance
understands persuasion, facilitation and change processes	all elements
serve as a model adult learner	all elements
demonstrate strong collegial skills--including critique, support, and reciprocity	collegiality
understand and communicate knowledge of effective teaching	technical assist-ance, modeling, cognitive dissonance/ consonance
evidence capacity for mutual trust and regard	trust, regard

Appendix E

"Control and Governance in the Implementation of Induction Programs"

(McDonald, 1980)

Control and Governance in the Implementation of Induction Programs

F. An induction program usually involves both a college or university and a school system. Listed below are elements of an induction program and the groups who might have responsibility for them in future programs. For both kinds of induction programs, next to each program element, indicates the number associated with the group which you think should have primary responsibility for the element. If primary responsibility should b shared, indicate the numbers of each group who should share in the responsibility.

Groups: (1) University; (2) School System; (3) Teacher Organization, and (4) State or Federal Program

Ratings		Program Elements
Intern Programs	Beginning Teacher Programs	
____	____	46. Program design
____	____	47. Program administration
____	____	48. Program implementation
____	____	49. Program monitoring
____	____	50. Program evaluation
____	____	51. Allocation of finances, (compensation for different personnel, materials, space)
____	____	52. Selection of beginning teachers
____	____	53. Training of beginning teachers
____	____	54. Place and supervision of beginning teachers
____	____	55. Evaluation of beginning teachers
____	____	56. Selection, training and evaluation of university faculty/supervisors
____	____	57. Selection, training and evaluation of district or school training staff including cooperating teachers

Other: (please specify)_____

_____

Comments: _____

Cost Factors

G. Induction programs might be financially supported by several different sources. For questions 58-61, check each source which you think should contribute financial support. Also for each question, please indicate which of the 6 funding sources should be the primary source of funding by circling the check mark associate with your choice.

	Funding Sources					
	Fed.	State	University	School System	Teacher Organization	Foundation
58. The experimental development of INTERN PROGRAMS	___	___	___	___	___	___
59. The long term operation of INTERN PROGRAMS	___	___	___	___	___	___
60. The experimental development of BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAMS	___	___	___	___	___	___
61. The long term operation of BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAMS	___	___	___	___	___	___

Other: (please specify)_____

_____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

H. Beginning Teachers and Intern Teachers might be compensated in several ways. Below are listed 4 alternatives for compensating INTERNS.

1. Receive partial or full pay as regular first-year teacher
2. Receive proportion of first-year teacher's pay plus university credits for internship
3. Receive university credit plus remission of tuition
4. Receive university credit only

	Method
62. Which of the 4 alternatives would be the most desirable method of compensation?	1 2 3 4
63. Which of the 4 alternatives would be the least desirable method of compensation?	1 2 3 4

Below are listed 4 alternatives for compensating BEGINNING TEACHERS.

1. No extra compensation
2. Release time from duties
3. Inservice credit
4. Extra pay

	Method
64. Which of the 4 alternatives would be the most desirable method of compensation?	1 2 3 4
65. Which of the 4 alternatives would be the least desirable method of compensation?	1 2 3 4

Other: (please specify)_____

_____

Comments:_____

_____

I. Cooperating experienced teachers might be compensated in a number of ways (money, credits, time). Four of these methods of compensation are listed below:

1. Regular pay, plus release time in proportion to number of inductees supervised
2. Regular pay, release time, and course credit
3. Regular pay, release time, and additional pay for each inductee supervised
4. Regular pay, release time, and pay at an hourly rate for each hour of supervision

		Method
66.	Which way would be the <u>most</u> desirable of compensating cooperating experiences teacher who are involved with <u>INTERN PROGRAMS</u>?	1 2 3 4
67.	Which way would be the <u>least</u> desirable of compensating cooperating experienced teachers who are involved with <u>INTERN PROGRAMS</u>?	1 2 3 4
68.	Which way would be the <u>most</u> desirable method of compensating cooperating experienced teachers who are involved with <u>BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAMS</u>?	1 2 3 4
69.	Which way would be the <u>least</u> desirable method of compensating cooperating experienced teachers who are involved with <u>BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAMS</u>?	1 2 3 4

Other: (please specify)_____

_____

Comments:_____

_____